

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bernacki (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0038109). Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernacki in view of Wald et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0211378).

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Chuo for the consideration given applicant's attorney at the interview of March 6, 2008. At the interview, agreement was reached with respect to the claims. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment to claim 1 did appear to overcome the Bernacki reference. Accordingly, in the absence of more relevant prior art, the captioned application should be in condition for allowance.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in the present application, as they now stand, patentably distinguish over the references cited and applied by the Examiner and are, therefore, in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is in order, and such favorable action and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

However, if after reviewing the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By:   
John C. Holman  
Reg. No. 22,769

400 Seventh Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2201  
(202) 638-6666  
Date: March 10, 2008  
JCH/JLS:crj